DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 263 FL 017 191

AUTHOR Nagai, Noriko
TITLE Topic Construction in Japanese.
PUB DATE Dec 87
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America (San Francisco, CA, December 27-30, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Grammar; *Japanese; Phrase Structure; *Sentence Structure; Structural Analysis (Linguistics); *Syntax; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS *Topicalization (Language)

ABSTRACT

A discussion of Japanese topic construction argues that topicalization is merely an attachment of the topic particle "wa". It also proposes that other operations associated with this construction, such as movement and base-generation, are not specifically related to topicalization but can be explained in terms of more general rules of Japanese. It is suggested that the analysis offered is more adequate, covers a wider range of data, and proposes simpler rules of topicalization than previous research. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED291263

Abstract

Topic Construction in Japanese

Noriko Nagai
Duke Univeristy

The goal of this paper is to show that topicalization is merely an attachment of the topic particle wa and that other operations allegedly associated with this construction such as movement and base-generation are not specifically related to topicalization but can be explained in terms of more general rules in Japanese. The operation, which permits the topic phrase to be moved anywhere, for example, is an instance of the scrambling rule. More generally the movement topicalization is an instance of Move-@. A topic position which is sister of S is base-generated by PS rule in Japanese. This paper offers a more adequate analysis of this construction, covers wider range of data, and proposes simpler rule of topicalization than Kuroda (1965), Kuno (1973), Ue (1982), Saito(1985), and Hooji (1985).

The organization of this paper is as follows. First, I will present the analysis of the topic construction. I will propose that there are two distinctive types of topics in Japanese, namely movement topics and base-generated topics.[1] Second, I will show the movement topicalization is an instance of the scrambling rule, observing five common properties between the two rules. Third, I will propose PS rule in Japanese which assures base-generated topic positions. Fourth, I will discuss how the topic particle, wa, is inserted.

presented at the LSA/AAAL/ADS Annual Meeting, December 1987,
San Francisco, California

FL017191

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Nagai

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Topic Construction in Japanese

Noriko Nagai
Duke Univeristy

0. Introduction

The goal of this paper is to show that topicalization is merely an attachment of the topic particle wa and that other operations allegedly associated with this construction such as movement and base-generation are not specifically related to topicalization but can be explained in terms of more general rules in Japanese. The operation, which permits the topic phrase to be moved anywhere, for example, is an instance of the scrambling rule. More generally the movement topicalization is an instance of Move-@. A topic position which is sister of S is base-generated by PS rule in Japanese. This paper offers a more adequate analysis of this construction, covers wider range of data, and proposes simpler rule of topicalization than Kuroda (1965), Kuno (1973), Ue (1982), Saito(1985), and Hooji (1985).

The organization of this paper is as follows. First, I will present the analysis of the topic construction. I will propose that there are two distinctive types of topics in Japanese, namely movement topics and base-generated topics.[1] Second, I will show the movement topicalization is an instance of the scrambling rule, observing five common properties between the two rules. Third, I will propose PS rule in Japanese which assures base-generated topic positions. Fourth, I will discuss how the topic particle, wa, is inserted.

1. Two Types of Topics

There are three distinctive properties, which distinguish topics into two types. First, the most notable difference between the two types of topics is

---

[1]This classification of topics is first made by Ue (1982). Following Ue, Nagai (1985) claims that there are two types of Topics, noting that one type of Topic is not an argument of an element, while the other is. Shooji (1986) also makes similar classification independently. Saito (1985) and Hooji (1985) also note two types of topics. Their classification is based on the syntactic categories of topic phrases, namely NP and PP topics. As we will see in the next section, their classification is empirically incorrect.

that a movement topic is an argument of either an NP, AP, or PP, while a base-generated topic is not an argument of any element, as evidenced in the following examples:

1. a. kono ronbun wa John ga kaita
   this thesis top nom wrote
   'This thesis, John wrote.'
   b. Mary no paatii e wa John to Hanako ga ikimashita
   gen party to top and nom went
   'To Mary's party, John and Hanako went.'

2. a. hana wa sakura ga ichiban kireida
   flowers top cherry blossoms nom most pretty
   'As for flowers, cherry blossoms are most pretty.'
   b. Tanaka kyooju wa saikin akachan ga umareta
   professor top recently baby nom was-born
   'As for Prof. Tanaka her baby was born recently.'

Examples (1.a) and (1.b) illustrate movement topics while examples (2.a) and (2.b) present base-generated topics. The topic phrase in (1.a) is an argument of the verb, kaita. That is the topic phrase, kono ronbun functions as the object of the verb. Likewise, the topic phrase in (1.b) is an argument of the postposition, e and functions as the object of this postposition. In examples 2.a and 2.b, on the contrary, the sentence-initial NP topics, namely hana wa and tanaka kyooju wa are not arguments of any elements in the clauses adjacent to these NP topics. The predicates in these examples, kirei in (2.a) and umareta in (2.b), are one-place predicates, which subcategorize only external arguments. The arguments of the predicates in examples (2.a) and (2.b) are sakura and kodomo respectively, and not the sentence-initial NP topics.

Second, the topic phrase of a movement topic bears a O-role assigned by a lexical head or predicate, while the topic phrase of a base-generated topic do not bear the O-role assigned by a lexical head nor predicate. Observe examples 3.a and 3.b which contains movement topics:

3. a. sono wain wa$_i$ Mary ga kinoo e$_i$ katta
   that wine top nom yesterday bought
   'That wine, mary bought yesterday.'
   b. John kara wa mada kurismas kaado ga e$_i$ konai
   from top yet Christmas card nom come-not
   'From John, I have't gotten a Christmas card yet.'

The topic, sono wain in example 3.a, receives the theme role from the verb, katta. Similarly, the NP John in the topic phrase in 3.b receives the goal role from the postposition, kara.

Contrary to movement topics, a base-generated topic does not receive a O-role from a lexical head nor predicate, but rather it bears the O-role which is compositionally assigned by the adjacent sentence. Kuno (1973) observes

that the base-generated topic must be related with the rest of the sentence[2], yet he states that "it is not clear what kind of relationship the theme (=a base-generated topic) and the comment must hold for the sentence to be grammatical" (p. 254). It seems two kinds of semantic relations between a base-generated topic and the rest of the sentence. To illustrate, obeserve the following examples:

4. a. spootu wa yakyu ga ichiban omosiroi
sports top baseball nom most interesting
'As for sports, baseball is most interesting.'
a'. *spootu no yakyu ga ichiban omosiroi
b. Mary wa imooto ga ima pari ni iru
top sister nom now Paris in is
'As for Mary, her sister is in Paris.'
b'. Mary no imooto ga ima pari ni iru

In 4.a, th topic phrase, spootu wa denotes general notion, which semantically entails the subject NP, yakyuu in the adjacenct clause. The semantic relation between the two NPs is a whole-and-a-part relation. In this relation, the topic phrase cannot be paraphrased in the NP no NP ga construciton as evidenced in 4.a'. In 4.b, the topic phrase, Mary wa indicates possesser[3]. Here, the semantic relation between the topic phrase and the NP in the adjacent clause is a possessor-and-possessee relation. In this semantic relation, the topic NP can be marked with the genitive no instead of wa as shown in example 4.b'.

Third, Ue (1982) observes that the movement topic is fronted, leaving a gap in the original position, while the base generated topic does not have a gap in the adjacent clause. To illustrate, observe the following examples:

5. a. sono shashin wa$_i$ John ga kyooto de e$_i$ totta
that picture top nom Kyoto in took
'That picture, John took in Kyoto.'
b. yooroppa e wa$_i$ dare mo ga e$_i$ iki-tagaru
Europe to top everyone nom go-wants
'To Europe everyone wants to go.'

---

[2]Following Kuno, Saito claims that a base-generated topic must be licensed by "aboutness relation" which requires a base-generated topic to be semantically related to the rest of the sentence.

[3]I am useing the word, "possessor" in a wider sense. That is, it does not exclude non-human topic NPs to express "possessor." Observe the following example:
i) a. Tokyo wa bukka ga takai
top prices nom high
'Speaking of Tokyo, prices (there) are expensive.'
b. Tokyo no bukka ga takai
gen prices nom high
'Tokyo's prices(=Prices in Tokyo) are expensive.'

6. a. kyoodai wa ane ga hitori imasu
siblings top sister nom one have
'As for siblings I have one sister.'

b. Nihon wa juutaku busoku ga sinkoku na mondai desu
Japan top housing shortage nom serious problem be
'In Japan the shortage of housing is a serious problem.'

Examples 5.a and 5.b indicate that the fronted topics, namely sono shashin wa and yooroppa e respectively, leave gaps in the original positions in the adjacent clauses. Examples 6.a and 6.b, however, do not have gaps in the adjacent clause.

In order to account for the above differences between the two types of topics, it is best to assume that the movement topic is derived via a movement rule, while the base-generated topic is derived via PS rules.

2. Movement Topicalization vs. Scrambling

This section argues that the movement topicalization which moves phrases marked with the topic particle wa is an instance of the scrambling rule. Saito (1985) convincingly argues that the movement which permits PP topics to be fronted is an instance of the scrambling rule. Yet, he remains implicit whether or not the movement which fronts NP topics is an instance of the scrambling rule. The analysis presented here shows that not only PP topics but also NP topics, which are arguments of verbs, postposition or adjectives, are moved anywhere by the scrambling rule. To show the movement topicalization is an instance of scrambling, I will compare syntactic properties of these two rules. In what follows, first I will present a brief summary of syntactic properties of the scrambling rule in Japanese. Then, each property of the scrambling rule is compared with that of the movement topicalization in detail.

2.1. Scrambling rule in Japanese

The scrambling rule in Japanese has four syntactic properties. First, as is well known, it is an optional movement rule, which moves an NP or PP to anywhere:

7. a. Mary ga toshokan de hon o yonde-iru
nom library at book acc read-ing
'Mary is reading a book at the library.'

b. toshokan de$_i$ Mary ga e$_i$ hon o yonde-iru

c. Mary ga hon o$_i$ toshokan de e$_i$ yonde-iru

Example 7.a illustrates the unmarked word order of Japanese: that is, a subject, a PP which indicates a place of action, a direct object and a verb. 7.b indicates that the PP is moved to the sentence initial position and 7.c indicates that the NP is moved to the position right to the subject.

Second, scrambling can be iterated as evidenced below:

8. hon o$_i$ toshokan de Mary ga e$_i$ e$_i$ yonde-iru
book acc library at nom read-ing
'Mary is reading a book at the library.'

Example 8 indicates that the NP, hon o, is moved after the PP, toshokan de, is moved to the sentence initial position.

Third, as Saito observes, the scrambling rule obeys the Subjacency Condition:

9. a. kore ga [kinoo Mary ga toshokan de e_i yonde-ita] hon desu
this nom yesterday nom library at read-ing book is
'This is the book Mary was reading at the library yesterday.'
b. *Mary ga_i kore ga [kinoo e_i toshokan de e_j yonde-ita] hon_j desu
c. *$toshokan\ de_i$ kore ga [kinoo Mary ga e_i e_j yonde-ita] hon_j desu

In 9.b the subject NP in the relative clause is moved to the sentence initial position, yielding an unacceptable sentence. Similarly, 9.c is unacceptable because the PP in the relative clause is fronted to the sentence initial position.

Fourth, scrambling does not allow resumptive pronouns as pointed out by Saito:

10. a. toshokan de_i Mary ga e_i hon o yonde-iru
b. *$toshokan_i$ de Mary ga $soko_i$ de hon o yonde-iru

11. a. hon o_i Mary ga toshokan de e_i yonde-riu
b. *hon_i o Mary ga toshokan de $sore_i$ o yonde-riu

As the examples above indicate, when the gaps are filled with the resumptive pronouns, namely soko in 10.b and sore in 11.b respectively, the resultant sentences become unacceptable.

2.2. Movement Topicalization and Scrambling

2.2.1. Optionality of Movement in Topic Construction

Although the most typical position for a topic phrase is the sentence initial position, it is not obligatory for a topic phrase to be in this position. In fact, a topic phrase does not have to move as evidenced below:

12. a. John ga Mary ni wa bara o okutta
nom to top roses acc sent
'To Mary John sent roses.'
b. yuube John ga sono kuroi kooto wa kiteita
last night nom that black coat top wear-ing
'John was wearing that black coat last night.'

Examples 12.a and 12.b indicate that the topicalized phrases, Mary ni wa and sono kuroi kooto wa respectively, stay in the original positions.

Topic phrases can be moved to positions other than the sentence initial position as illustrated below:

13. a. John ga Mary ni bara o okutta
nom to roses sent
'John sent roses to Mary.'
b. John ga $bara\ wa_i$ Mary ni e_i okutta

14. a. John ga kodomo ni mainichi piano o hik-aseta
nom child dat everyday piano acc play-causative
'John made his child play the piano everyday.'
b. John ga piano wa$_i$ kodomo ni mainichi e$_i$ hik-aseta

In examples 13.b and 14.b the object NPs are topicalized and moved to the position right to the subjects.

As examples 12--14 indicate, the movement is not an obligatory part of topicalization. Furthermore, even if a topic phrase is moved, the sentence initial position is not the only position to which the topic phrase moves. Thus, the above observation suggests that the movement employed to move a topic phrase anywhere is an instance of the scrambling rule.

2.2.2. Movement topicalization and subjacency

If, in fact, the movement topicalization is an instance of scrambling, it should obey Subjacency. As the following examples indicate, the movement topicalization obeys the Subjacency Condition:

15. *Mary ni wa$_i$ [John ga e$_i$ e$_j$ ageta] hon$_j$ ga nakunatta
to top nom gave book nom disappeared

16. *Tanaka sensei wa$_i$ [gakusei ga e$_j$ e$_i$ shootaishita]
paatii$_j$ wa totemo nigiyakadatta

17. *sono gakusei wa$_i$ [e$_i$ Tanaka sensei o e$_j$ shootaishita] paatii wa
totemo nigiyakadatta

Example 15 is unacceptable because the PP topic in the relative clause, Mary ni wa is moved into the sentence initial position, hence violating subjacency. Likewise, example 16 and 17 are unacceptable, since NP topics in the relative clauses, namely tanaka sensei wa and sono gakusei wa respectively, are moved to the sentence initial positions, violating the Subjacency Condition. Thus, the movement topicalization observes the Subjacency Condition.

2.2.3. Movement Topicalization and Resumptive Pronouns

The movement topicalization disallows resumptive pronouns just like scrambling does:

18. a. Mary ga [John ga sono ronbun o kaita] to itta
nom nom that paper acc wrote comp said
'Mary said that John wrote that paper.'
b. sono ronbun$_i$ wa Mary ga [John ga e$_i$ kaita] to itta
c. *sono ronbun$_i$ wa Mary ga [John ga sore$_i$ o kaita] to itta

19. a. Mary ga [John ga nihon e ikitagatte-iru] to itta
nom nom Japan to go-want-ing comp said
'Mary said that John wants to go to Japan.'
b. nihon e$_i$ wa Mary ga [John ga e$_i$ ikitagatte-iru] to itta
c. *nihon$_i$ e wa Mary ga [John ga soko$_i$ e ikitagatte-iru] to itta

In example 18.b the NP, sono ronbun is topicalized leaving a gap in the original position. In example 18.c the gap is filled with a resumptive pronoun, namely sore, yielding an unacceptable sentence. Likewise, 19.b indicates that the PP, nihon e is fronted to the sentence initial position leaving a gap. 19.c is unacceptable because the resumptive pronoun, soko, is used instead of a gap. As the examples above indicate, resumptive pronouns are prohibited in the movement topicalization.

2.2.4. Iterativeness of the movement topicalizaton

The movement topic can be iterated as observed by Ue:

20. a. Kotoshi no owari ni wa kono biru ni wa atarasii garoo ga
this year gen end at top this building at top new gallery nom
umareru koto ni naru daroo.
born fact become may
"By the end of this year, a new gallery will have appeared in this building."

b. Kono gakko ni wa seihu kara wa hozyo ga nakatta
this school to top government from top subsidy nom not
"To this school, from the government, a subsidy was not (given)."

As the above examples indicate multiple movement topics are possible. Example 20.a contains two topic phrases, namely kotoshi no owarini wa and kono biru ni wa. Similary example 20.b contains two topic phrases, kono gakko ni wa and seihu kara wa. The order of two movement topics can be exchanged each other:

21. a. kono biru ni wa Kotoshi no owari ni wa atarasii garoo ga umareru
this year gen end at top this building at top new gallery nom born
koto ni naru daroo.
fact become may
"By the end of this year, a new gallery will have appeared in this building."

b. seihu kara wa kono gakko ni wa hozyo ga nakatta
this school to top government from top subsidy nom not
"To this school, from the government, a subsidy was not (given)."

As we have seen above, movement topicalization shares all the syntactic properties exhibited by the scrambling rule. This observation suggests that movement topicalization is, in fact, an instance of the scrambling rule.

2.3. Alternative Analyses

This section conmpares the analysis presented here with previous analyses on topic construction. First, I will argue against Saito's and Hoji's analysis, which I characterize as a NP/PP topic analysis. Second, I argue against Fukui's analysis, in which he claims that movement topicalizaiton and the scrambling are two different types of movement.

2.3.1. NP/PP Topic Aanalysis

2.3.1.1. Saito (1985)

Based on the syntactic categories of topics, Saito classifies topic phrases into two types: NP topics and PP topics. Saito provides two pieces of evidence to support this classification: 1) PP topics but not NP topics obey the Subjacency Condition; and 2) PP topics but not NP topics disallows resumptive pronouns. To illustrate Saito's classification of topic phrases, observe the following examples taken from Saito:

22. a. sono hito$_i$ wa [[e$_i$ sinda noni] dare mo kanasimanakatta
that person TOP died although anyone saddened not was
"Speaking of that person, no one was saddened although (he) died."

b. Sono sinsi$_i$ wa [[[e$_i$ e$_i$ kiteiru] yoohuku$_i$] ga yogorete iru
that gentleman TOP wearing suit NOM dirty be
"Speaking of that gentleman, the suit he is wearing is dirty."

23. a. *Pekin ni wa John ga [[t itta koto ga aru hito] o mituketa rasii
Beijing in top nom went fact nom have person acc found seem
'It seems that John found a person who has been to Peking.'

b. *Russell ni wa John ga [[t atta koto ga aru nihonzin] o oozei
to top nom met fact nom have Japanese acc many
sitte iru rasii
know seem
'It seems that John knows many Japanese who actually met Ruseell.'

24. a. ??John$_i$ wa [s Bill ga [s' Mary ga kare$_i$ o kiratte iru to] omoikonde
top nom nom he acc dislike that be-convinced
iru rasii]
seem
"Speaking of John, it seems that Bill is convinced that Mary dislikes him."

b. ?Sono boosi$_i$ wa [s John ga [NP e$_i$ sore$_j$ o kabutte ita hito] o yoku
that hat top nom it acc wearing person acc well
sitteiru rasii
seem
"Speaking of that hat, it seems that John knows the person who was wearing it very well."

25. a. *Russell$_i$ ni wa John ga [[kare$_i$ ni atta koto ga aru] hito] o oozei
with top nom he with met fact nom have person acc many
sitteiru rasii
know seem
"It seems that John knows many people who met Russell."

b. *Hirosima$_i$ kara wa Amerika ni [[soko$_i$ kara kita] hito] ga oozei iru
from top in that from came person nom many is
"From Hiroshima, there are many people in the States who came from there."

Examples 22.a and 22.b indicate that NP topics do not observe the Subjacency Condition, while 23.a and 23.b show that PP topics observe the Subjacency Condition. Examples 24 and 25 indicate that PP topics but not NP topics disallow resumptive pronouns. Based upon observed syntactic differences between PP- and NP-topics with respect to the Subjacency Condition and the

possibility of resumptive pronouns, Saito concludes that PP topics are derived from a movement rule, more generally via the scrambling rule. As for NP topics, Saito further classifies them into two types: one which does not bind a subjacent empty element (henceforth, NP topic I) ane the other which does (henceforth, NP topics II). The following examples illustrate two types of NP topics:

26. a. sakana wa tai ga oisii (NP topics I)
fish top red snapper nom delicious
'As for fish, red snapper is delicious.'
b. Ano hon wa John ga katta (NP topics II)
that book top nom bought
'That book, John bought.'

According to Saito, NP topics I are base-generated while NP topics II can be either base-generated or derived form a movement rule. Thus, NP topics II like 26.b have two distinctive d-structures:

27. a. $[_{s'}$ ano hon wa $[_{s}$ John ga e katta]
b. $[_{s'}$ ano hon wa $[_{s}$ John ga t katta]

27.a is the d-structure of 27.b in which the NP topic is base-generated, while 27.b is the d-structure of 27.b in which the NP topic is derived via movement, leaving a trace.

Saito's analysis of the topic construction confronts two serious problems. First, contrary to Saito's observation, both NP topics and PP topics obey the Subjacency Condition and disallows resumptive pronouns as observed in section 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 respectively. The data which Saito uses to show that NP topics do not obey Subjacency is somewhat special ones. 22.a, for example is an instance of an extraction of an NP topic out of the adjunct clause, noni. It is well known that an extraction out of an adjunct clause is much easier than out of a relative clause. Although 22.b is an instance of an extraction of an NP topic out of a relative clause, there is a distinct feature in this example. The moved NP is a subject NP. To illustrate this point, compare example 22.b with example 28 used in Hasegawa (1981):

28. *yoohuku$_j$ wa [e$_i$ e$_j$ kite-i-ta] shinshi$_i$ ga yukuehumei da
suit top wear-ing-past gentleman nom missing
"The suit the gentleman who wore (it) is missing."

In example 28 the object NP, instead of the subject NP, is moved to the sentence initial position, yielding an unacceptable sentence. Thus, Saito's claim based on peculiar examples, such as 22.a and 22.b, is not convincing.

The data Saito provides to show that only PP topics but not NP topics disallow resumptive pronouns is not empirically correct. Acceptability judgement on the topic sentences with resumptive pronouns varies from one native speaker to another. Yet most native speakers, if not all, found their intuition contrary to Saito's. As Saito himself admits the marginality of examples 24.a and 24.b, these examples are as bad as 25.a and 25.b to all the informants I asked and to myself. Interestingly enough, Ue notes that NP

topics are similar to PP topics in that NP topics also disallow resumptive pronouns. She provides the following examples:

29. *Tanaka sensei$_i$ wa kare$_i$ ga daigaku de eigo o osiete-iru (=Ue's 60)
professor top he nom university at English acc teaching
"As for Prof. Tanaka, he is teaching English in a college."

30. *tyookan$_i$ wa otoosan ga sore$_i$ o ima yonde-imasu(=Ue's 61)
morning paper top father nom it acc now reading is
"As for the morning paper, Father is reading it now."

The two piece of evidence offered by Saito to support his claim is empirically incorrect. Thus, Saito's classification made on the basis of erroneous observation does not hold.

Even if Saito's observation were correct, the way he derives NP topics II is problematic. Saito claims that NP topics II can be either base-generated or derived via a movement rule. This naturally predicts that NP topics II obey the Subjacency Condition and disallow resumptive pronouns when they are derived from a movement rule while NP topics II do not obey the Subjacency Condition and allow resumptive pronouns when they are base-generated. It is very unlikely that NP topics II have such two contradictory properties with respect to the Subjacency Condition as well as with respect to the possibility of resumptive pronouns. In fact, as I have shown in section 2.2.2. and 2.2.3, NP topics II obey the Subjacency condition and disallows resumptive pronouns. Relevant examples are repeated here as xx and xx:

31. *Mary ni wa$_i$ [John ga $\underline{e}_i$ $\underline{e}_j$ ageta] hon$_j$ ga nakunatta
to top nom gave book nom disappeared

32. *Tanaka sensei wa$_i$ [gakusei ga $\underline{e}_j$ $\underline{e}_i$ shootaishita]
paatii$_j$ wa totemo nigiyakadatta

33. *sono gakusei wa$_i$ [$\underline{e}_i$ Tanaka sensei o $\underline{e}_j$ shootaishita] paatii wa totemo nigiyakadatta

34. a. Mary ga [John ga sono ronbun o kaita] to itta
nom nom that paper acc wrote comp said
'Mary said that John wrote that paper.'
b. sono ronbun$_i$ wa Mary ga [John ga $\underline{e}_i$ kaita] to itta
c. *sono ronbun$_i$ wa Mary ga [John ga sore$_i$ o kaita] to itta

35. a. Mary ga [John ga nihon e ikitagatte-iru] to itta
nom nom Japan to go-want-ing comp said
'Mary said that John wants to go to Japan.'
b. nihon e$_i$ wa Mary ga [John ga $\underline{e}_i$ ikitagatte-iru] to itta
c. *nihon$_i$ e wa Mary ga [John ga soko$_i$ $\underline{e}$ ikitagatte-iru] to itta

Examples 31-33 indicate NP topics obey the subjacency condition. Examples 34 and 35 show that NP topics disallows resumptive pronouns. Thus, Saito's analysis is not only empirically incorrect but also wrongly predicts that NP topics II have contradictory properties with respect to the Subjacency Condition, and with respect to the possibility of resumptive pronouns.

2.3.1.2. Hooji (1985)

Hoji extends Saito's analysis of the topic construction. Following Saito, Hoji assumes that PP topics are derived form movement and that NP topics I are base-generated. Futhermore, Hoji tries to support Saito's claim that NP topics II can be derived from either movement or base-generation. Hoji attempts to do so by associating semantic distinction between two functions of the particle wa, namely "thematic wa" and "contrastive wa" with derivational differences between the NP topics II. That is, according to Hoji, a base-generated topic NP II has the thematic interpretation, while a preposed NP topic II has the contrastive interpretation. To illustrate Hoji's point, observe the following examples:

36. a. ano hon wa John ga katta
    b. $[_{s'}$ ano hon$_i$ $[_s$ John ga $\underline{e}_i$ katta]]

37. a. ano hon wa John ga katta
    b. $[_s$ ano hon$_i$ $[_s$ John ga $\underline{t}_i$ katta]]

The NP topic II, ano hon wa John ga katta, has two different d-structures as shown 36.b and 37.b. The topic phrase in 36.a is base-generated, thereby it results in the thematic reading, whereas the topic phrase in 37.a is moved by scrambling, thereby it results in the contrastive reading.

Because Hoji assumes that the contrastive reading of a topic phrase is assoicated with the fact that that topic is derived from movement he goes on to claim that all PP topics have the contrastive reading. Recall that PP topics are derived from movement.

Hoji's analysis of the topic constraction faces a serious problem becasue the assumption that the thematic reading of a topic phrase corresponds to the base-generation of that topic and the contrastive reading of a topic phrase corresponds to the movement of that topic does not hold for the following three reasons. First, although PP topics are derived from movement they do not always have the contrastive reading as evidenced below:

38. a. kono daigaku ni wa totemo yuumeina igak kenkyuujo ga aru
       this university in top very famous medical institute nom is
       'Speaking of this university, there is a famous dedical reseach institute.'

39. b. Mary ni wa maeni ichi-do nihon de atta koto ga aru
          to top before once Japan in met fact nom is
       'Speaking of Mary, I have met her once in Japan.'

Although the PP topics in the above examples can be contrastive, they are more readily interpreted as thematic, indicating what the rest of the sentence is about. In example 38.a the speaker must be talking about the university s/he is at and example 39.b the speaker must be talking about Mary. Because PP topics are not always associated with the contrastive reading, the assumption that movement topics have contrastive reading is questionable.

Second, Kuno claims that a topic phrase can be "thematic" if that topic phrase is generic or anaphoric[4]. In other words, non-anphoric topics can not have the thematic reading as shown in the following examples:

40. ame wa futte imasu
    rain top. fall ing
    'It is raining'

The above example is unacceptable if the intended reading of the topic phrase is thematic, while the sentence is acceptable if the intended reading of the topic phrase is contrastive. According to Hoji, NP topics like ame wa in example 40 can be derived eithre from base-generation and movement. If ame wa is base generated, it resluts in the thematic reading, while if ame wa is derived via movement, it results in the contrastive reading. However, because ame in the above sentence is not generic nor anaphoric, it must be base-generated. In other words, whether a topic phrase has the thematic reading or contrastive reading is not dependent on how they are derived as Hoji assumes. Rather, the distinction between the thematic and contrastive reading is made on a discourse function; whether the topic NP is registered in the present discourse or not.

Third, Kuno also notes that when an NP is generic or anaphotic, that NP with topic wa is ambigous between the readings of "thematic" and "contrastive." However, if the prominant intonation is place out a topic phrase, that topic is contrastive.

41. a. John wa itumo toshokan de benkyo site-iru
        top always library in study do-ing
      'Speaking of John, he always studies at the library."
41. b. John **wa** itumo toshokan de benkyo site-iru
        top always library in study do-ing
      'John (but not other students) always studies at the library.'

Here again, the distiction between the thematic and contrastive reading of an NP topic is not made on the basis of how that topic NP is derived, but rather on the basis of intonation contour.

Thus, positing two distinctive syntactic derivations for NP topic II complicates the grammar of Japanese and is an undesirable move.

2.3.2. Fukui (1986)

---

[4]By anaphoric Kuno means that "objects and concepts that have been mentioned and recorded in the registry of the present discourse" (p. 41).

Fukui (1986) claims that the movement topicalization is an different type of movement from scrambling[5]. He alleges the movement topicalization is an instance of adjunction and the scrambling rule is an instance of a substitution because the former cannot be iterative. Yet, as we have seen in section 2.2.4., the movement topicalization can be iterative. Thus, Fukui's claim that the movement topic and the scrambling are distinctive rules does not hold.

Another piece of evidence which allegedly supports Fukui's claim that topicalization is an adjunction operation and scrambling is a substitution operation is that the former disallows a wh-element to be moved, while the latter allows such movement. Observe the following examples taken from Fukui(29 & 30):

42. a. *dono hon wa John ga katta ka
which book top nom bought Q
"Which book did John buy?"
b. *nani wa John ga katta ka
what top nom bought Q
"What did John buy?"

43. a. sono hon o John ga katta
that book acc nom bought
"That book, John bought."
b. dono hon o John ga katta ka
which book acc nom bought Q
"Which book did John buy?"

The data given above may not, in fact, support Fukui's claim because topicalization does allow some wh-elements to be topicalized[6] as the following pair of examples from Ue indicate:

44. a. Dono kuni ni wa subarasii koosokudooro ga aru no
which country in top wonderful highway nom is Q
"In which country are there wonderful highways?"
b. dare kara wa henji ga konakatta no
who from top answer nom came-not Q

---

[5]Fukui differentiates substitution from adjunction in the following way:

i) (Fukui (52))
A movement is an adjunction iff the structure created by that movement is non-base-generable (otherwise, the movement is a substitution.)

The above definition assures that scrambling can be iterative because it is an operation within a projection of V, whereas adjunction cannot be iterated because adjunction is made to a projection of a Functional category. In Fukui's system of projection, Lexical categories can be iterated whereas Functional category is unique. Fukui regards the movement topicalization as an adjunction of I (=INFL).

[6]The topicalization of wh-element is limited to PP topics for unknown reasons.

"From whom did an answer come?"

The above examples constitute evidence against Fukui's claim that topicalization is an adjunction unlike the scrambling rule. On the contrary, they provide evidence for my claim that the movement topicalization and the scrambling rule are the same type of movement.

3. Syntactic Position of a Base Generated Topic

This section, first, proposes PS rule which generates a topic position for a topic phrase which is not an argument of V, P, or A. Then, it discusses whether or not this base-generated topic position is A'-position.

3.1. PS rule

Based upon the syntactic properties of the base-generated topic observed in section 2, I propose the following PS rule:

45. S'------->Topic* S
    Topic---->N" wa
    S-------->N" V"

An asterisk attached to the Topic in the above PS rule indicates that multiple base-generated topics are possible. Observe the following examples:

46. a. Natu wa supootu wa suiei ga ichiban da
       summer top sport top swimming nom best is
       Speaking of summer, as for sports, swimming is best."
    b. Aki wa kudamono wa nasi ga ichiban oisii
       autumn top fruit top pear nom most delicious
       Speaking of Autumn, as for fruit pears are most delicious."

Example 46.a contains two base-generated topics, namely natu wa and supootu wa. Likewise, example 46.b contains two base-generated topics, namely aki wa and kudamono wa. These multiple base-generated topics are rare. However, base-generated topics can be iterative as long as appropriate interpretation can be given.

Although the PS rule proposed above generates the Topic sister of S, it does not amounts to suggest that the order of a base-generated topic and movement topic is fixed. As expected by the unbound nature of the scrambling rule, a movement topic can be fronted to the left of the Topic position. Observe the following examples used in Ue[7]:

---

[7]Ue, however, claims that the base-generated topic resists scrambling, providing the following examples:

i) a. [Supootu wa] yakyuu ga itiban sakan desu
      sports top baseball nom first popular is
      'As for sports, base ball is the most popular.'
   b. [Supootu wa] yakyuu ga itiban sakan desu

(Footnote Continued)

47. a. Sakana wa boku wa tai ga suki da
fish top I top red-snapper nom like
"As for fish, I like red-snapper."
b. Boku wa sakana wa tai ga suki da

48. a. Supootu wa nihon de wa yakyuu ga sakan-desu
sports top Japan in top baseball nom popular
"As for sports, in Japan, baseball is popular."
b. Nihon de wa supootu wa yakyuu ga sakan-desu

49. a. gaikokugo wa daigaku de wa huransugo o torimasita
foreign language top university in top French acc took
"As for a foreign language, in college (I) took French."
b. daigaku de wa gaikokugo wa huransugo o torimasita

The above examples show that the order of a base-generated topic and a movement topic can be exchanged. Example 47.b, for instance, has the movement topic, boku wa which precedes the base-generated topic, sakana wa. Similarly, in examples 48 and 49, movement topics precede base-generated topics.

It is not difficult to come up with counterexamples to the claim that the order of the base-generated topic and the movement topic is not fixed. Observe the following examples in which the exchange of the base-generated topic and the movement topic yields unacceptable sentences:

50. a. Kazoku wa boku wa tai ga suki da
family top I top red-snapper like
"As for family members, I like red snapper."
b. *boku wa kazoku wa tai ga suki da

51. a. Supootu wa yakyuu wa yooroppa de sakan de wa arimasen
sports top baseball top Europe in popular not
"As for sports, baseball is not popular in Europe."
b. *Yakyuu wa supoots wa yooroppa de sakan de wa arimasen

52. a. gaikoku go wa doitu go wa amari ninki ga arimasen
Foreign language top German top very popularity nom no
"As for a foreign language, German is not so popular."
b. *doitu go wa gaikoku to wa amari ninki ga arimasen

The unacceptability of the above examples is due to a semantic constraint rather than the scrambling is prohibited between the Topic and S boundary. In the above examples, the base-generate topic NPs are collective nouns and the movement topic NPs denote sets of what these base-generated topic NPs denote.

(Footnote Continued)
To account for counterexamples to her claim such as 34--36, she proposes an ad hoc rule which fronts a movement topic past a base-generated topic. This move, however, is undesirable, creating a special movement rule which is distinct from scrambling. As we will see below in the text, my analysis can overcome this problem.

For instance, in example 51, the movement topic NP, yakyuu 'baseball,' is a set of what the base-generated topic, supoots wa 'sports,' denotes. When a movement topic, which is a 'set' NP, precedes a base-generated topic, which is a 'collective' NP, the resultant sentence is unacceptable. Collective nouns must precede set nouns. Example 48.b, on the contrary, is acceptable because the base-generated topic, which is a 'collective' NP (supootu 'sports') still precedes a 'set' noun (yakyuu'base ball') even after the topic phrase, nihon de wa moves to the sentence initial position.

3.2. Is the base-generated topic position A'-position?

The base-generated topic position is A'-position (A'-position = A-position in this paper) because as we observed in section 2, a base-generated topic is not an argument of V, P or A. Kuroda (1983) makes an interesting observation with respect to the A'-position in the double nominative construction such as the following example:

53. nihonjin ga se ga hikui (=Kuroda (36))
Japanese nom height nom short
'It is Japanese who is short.'

Kuroda proposes the following syntactic structure for the above example:

54. [.....X ga [...t...]s2 Predicate]s1

Kuroda questions whether or not the position marked with X is an A'-position, noting the first NP-ga, which occupies the X position, undergoes grammatical relational change in several constructions. When the particle ga which marks the first NP in the double nominative construction is changed to the particle wa, it yields a base-generated topic as shown below:

55. Nihon-zin wa se ga hikui
Japanese top height nom short
'As for Japanese, they are short.'

Thus, Kuroda's observation with respect to whether the first NP-ga in the double nominative construction occupies A- or A'-position is significant for a base-generated topic position.

Kuroda observes that the first NP-ga undergoes grammatical relational change under the following constructions:

56. nihonzin o (motto) se o hikuku suru keikaku (=Kuroda (37))
Japanese acc more height acc short do plot
'a plot to make the height of Japanese shorter'

57. a. se o hikuku suru no wa nihon-zin (o) da
height acc short do gen top Japanese acc be
'It is Japanese that (we) make shorter.'
b. *se o hikuku suru no wa nihon-zin ga da

58. watasi wa hinon-zin o se ga hikui to omou
I top Japanese acc height nom short comp think
'I consider Japanese to be short.'

Example 56 illustrates the causativization of adjectives. As the example indicates, the first NP-ga in A'position is marked with the accusative o under the construction in question. Example 57.a presents cleft construction, in which the first NP is marked with o. When this NP is marked with ga instead of o, the resultant sentence becomes unacceptable as example 57.b indicates. Example 58 indicates the object-to-subject raising. The first NP-ga in the double nominative construction also undergoes this process.

As expected a base-generated topic such as nihon jin wa in example 55 also undergoes the grammatical relational change under the constructions in question, yielding sentences exactly same as examples 56--58. However, base-generated topics such as in the following examples do not undergo the grammatical relational change under the constructions in question:

59. Hana wa sakura ga ichiban kirei da
flowers top cherry blossoms nom most pretty be
'As for flowers, cherry blossoms are prettiest.'

60. a. *Hana o sakura ga ichiban kirei ni suru keikaku
flowers acc cherry blossoms nom most pretty do plot
'a plot to make the flower of cherry blossoms prettiest'
b. Hana wa sakura o ichiban kirei ni suru keikaku

61. a. *sakura ga ichiban kirei ni suru no wa hana o da
b. *sakura ga ichiban kirei ni suru no wa hana ga da
62. a. *watashi wa hana o sakura ga ichban kirei da to omou

There is a distinct difference between the base-generated topic which undergoes grammatical relational change and the one which does not. Compare the following examples:

63. a. nihonjin wa se ga hikui
Japanese top height nom short
'As for Japanese, they are short.'
b. hana wa sakura ga ichiban kirei desu
flower top cherry blossoms nom most pretty be
'As for flowers, cherry blossoms are prettiest.'

The base-generated topic in example 63.a undergoes grammatical relational change as evidenced in 56--58, while the base-generated topic in example 63.b does not, as exemplified in 60--62. The base-generated topic in 63.a can be marked with the genitive case, no, instead of wa, while the base-generated topic in 63.b cannot as illustrated below:

64. a. nihonjin no se ga hikui
b. *hana no sakura ga ichiban kirei desu

This semantic contrast may be due to whether or not a base-generated topic can undergo grammatical relational change. That is, those base-generated topic NPs which undergo grammtical relational change under the construction in question have the syntactic structure of 64.a rather than 63.a. If that is the case, the base-generated topic position is an A'-position without any problem.

4. Topicalization

As we have seen in the above sections, what has been called topicalization can be reduced to just an attachment of the topic particle wa. The movement which fronts a topic phrase is an instance of the scrambling rule as discussed in section 2. Topic position is generated by PS rules for a topic, which is not an argument of V, P, or A. In this section I show how the topic particle wa is assigned.

4.1. Wa-assignment

I propose that the particle wa is assigned in the following manner at d-structure[8]:

65. Insert the particle wa freely in a position sister of P' and/or of N' at d-structure.

This assignment of the particle wa, in fact, should not be regarded as a special rule. All lexical items are inserted at d-structure according to their subcategorization frame. Thus, the syntactic environment in which the particle wa is inserted, namely a position sister of P' and/or of N', must be noted in the subcategorization frame, of the particle wa as follows:

66. Wa: a topic marker, [P'] , [N']

Fukui proposes that the particle wa is attached to a phrase which is adjoined to I'(In my PS rule, I'=S). My approach of the particle wa assignment is better than Fukui's particle wa assignment for two reasons. First, Fukui's approach cannot explain wa assignment in the following examples, in which topic phrases remain in the original positions:

67. a. Mary ga toshokan de wa amari yoku benkyoo dekimasen
nom library at top very well study can not
"Mary cannot study at the library very well."
b. Mary ga Bill wa patii ni shootai shimasendeshita
nom top party to invite not-past
"Mary did not invite Bill to the party."

None of the topic phrases in the above examples are fronted to a position sister of S. Fukui's wa assignment, thus, fails to mark the topic phrases under S.

Second, the particle wa assignment proposed here can also explain why the sequence of particles of ga-wa/wa-ga and o-wa/wa-o is prohibited, although Fukui's wa assignement cannot. As the following examples indicate the particle wa can never be attached to before or after the particles ga and o:

---

[8]One may suggest that the particle wa is assigned structurally at s-structure just like the case of the nominative case marking. However, I oppose to this idea because it fails to explain wa-assignment to the topic phrases in examples 55.a and 55.b and the ban of the particle sequence ga-wa/wa-ga and o-wa/wa-o.

68. a. *Mary ga wa/ wa ga hon o yonde-iru
nom top top nom book acc read-ing
'Mary is reading a book.'
b. *Mary ga hon o wa/ wa o yonde iru

The unacceptability of the above examples can be easily explained when we assume that free insertion of wa takes place at d-structure, and the nominative and accusative case assignment take place at s-structure under the strict adjacency condition as assumed in Stowell (1981). This assumption is quite sound because wa insertion is a lexical insertion and should be inserted at d-structure, while the nominative and accusative case assignment are structurally governed, hence they must take place at s-structure. Furthermore, the nominative case and accusative case are assigned to adjacent NPs. Thus, if there is the intervening topic particle wa, the nominative nor accusative case is assigned to NPs[9].

5. Summary

This paper showed that there are two distinct types of topics in Japanese, namely, a movement topic and a base-generated topic. Furthermore, what has been called topicalization can be reduced to merely an attachment of the topic particle wa. In other words, the movement which moves a movement topic anywhere is an instance of the scrambling rule. PS rule generates a topic position sister of S.

---

[9]There is a minor problem with regard to the case assignment of the particle ni. A handful of verbs mark their objects with the particle ni. The sequence of the particles ni-wa is allowed. Yet, this problem can be solved by assuming that the particle ni is not an accusative case but rather a postposition, which is assigned to N' at d-structure.

References

Baltin, M. (1982) "A Landing Site Theory of Movement Rules," LI 13:1

Chomsky, N. (1977) "On Wh-movement," in P. Culicover, T. Wasow and A. Akmajian, eds., Formal Syntax, Academic Press, New York, New York.

Chomsky, N. (1981) Lectures on Government and Binding, Foris, Dordrecht.

Chomsky, N. (1986) Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin and Use, Praeger, New York, New York

Fukui, N. (1986) A Theory of Category Projection and Its Application, Doctoral dissertation, MIT

Gueron, J. and R. May. (1984) "Extraposition and Logical Form," LI 15:1

Hasegawa, N. (1981) A Lexical Interpretive Theory with Emphasis on the Role of Subject, Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

Hoji, H. (1985) Logical Form Constraints and Configurational Structures in Japanese, Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

Kitagawa, C. (1982) "Topic Constructions in Japanese," Lingua 52,175-214.

Kuno. S. (1973) The Structure of the Japanese Language, The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Kuroda, S.-Y. (1983) "What can Japanese Say about Government and Binding," WCCFL II.

Nagai, N. (1985) Japanese Passives and Causatives, Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

Saito, M. (1985) Some Asymmetries in Japanese and Their Theoretical Implication, Doctoral dissertation, MIT

Shoji, A. (1986) Dake and Sika in Japanese: Syntax, Semantics, and Pragmatics, Doctoral dissertation, Cornel University, Ithaca, New York.

Stowell, T. (1981) Origins of Phrase Structure, Doctoral dissertation, MIT

Ue, N. (1982) A Crossing Constraint in Japanese Syntax, Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.